A U M

To live, not commodiously in the Reputable, the Plausible, the Half, but resolutely n the Whole, the Good, the True. —GOETHE

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXI August, 1943 No. 10

FORMLESS AND FREE

THE characteristic of Theosophical *philosophy,* as distinguished from its particular tenets and applications, in every era, is its complete freedom from rigid form and conventional rite—from even the more or less innocuous psychic niceties which have marked mysticism in the West. The Theosophical philosophy, wherever found, is Adept-Wisdom, and the adepts need none of the little external supports, the mannered sanctions and pious phrasings which creep into the discourse of those in whom there remains any trace of priestcraft.

When an adept speaks or writes, his Manas creates directly, out of the raw material of current usage, a vital form for the age-old truths. Half-taught disciples may repeat his words, placing more emphasis on their juxtaposition than their meaning, and then there is the result that, through the centuries, dogmas are born and attributed to a being whose whole life was a repudiation of dogma, of unmeaning forms. When the truth is wholly lost, another Teacher must come.

The evolution of priestly ways and cant doctrines follows from reliance upon the psychic nature instead of upon the Self. The Self is satisfied by principles, but the psychic nature takes delight in a familiar formula, a familiar feeling. The psychic nature resists originality, it shuns change and creative effort. It fears that which is above and beyond itself. It establishes many defenses against the direct and penetrating examinations of the untrammeled mind. It invokes the sanctity of tradition, the custom of the majority, the mechanisms of sacred phrase; and, sometimes for centuries, it succeeds in enthralling the lower minds of the masses so that they are unable to rise or to respond to spiritual perception.

But always, in the progress of cycles, an ultimate conjunction of events takes place, wherein the old declining forms must meet and fail to withstand the self-reproductive energy of Manasic ideas. The message brought by the Teacher inaugurates the New Cycle. It is then that Theosophy once more becomes the foundation of the World Religions of the future. Slowly, it leavens the contemporary forms with the ichor of freedom; gradually it plants new ideas on clean places, and in the end, men learn to have courage, to think for themselves. They begin to realize that the only true embodiment of knowledge is the embodiment of thought that is their own, of wisdom made their own through study, reflection and experience.

The presence of Theosophy in the world marks such a period in history. That time is now.

THEOSOPHICAL AUTHORITY

In the study of the Secret Doctrine it is not a matter of likes and dislikes, of belief or unbelief, but solely a matter of intelligence and understanding. He who acknowledges his ignorance and yet is unwilling to lay aside his likes and dislikes, and even his creeds and dogmas, for the time, in order to see what is presented in its own light and purely on its merits, has neither need nor use for the Secret Doctrine. Even where a greater number of propositions are accepted or "believed," and a few are rejected, the synthetic whole is entirely lost sight of. But, says some one, this is a plea for blind credulity, an attempt to bind the mind and the conscience of man to a blind acceptance of these doctrines. No one but the ignorant or the dishonest can make such an assertion in the face of the facts. Listen to the following from p. xix. Introduction to the *Secret Doctrine:* "It is above everything important to keep in mind that no theosophical book acquires the least additional value from pretended authority." If that be advocating blind credulity, let the enemies of the T. S. make the most of it. If any authority pertains to the *Secret Doctrine,* it must be sought inside, not outside. It must rest on its comprehensiveness, its completeness, its continuity and reasonableness; in other words, on its *philosophical synthesis,* a thing missed alike by the superficial and the contentious, by the indolent, the superstitious, and the dogmatic. —W. Q. J.

DIALOGUES BETWEEN THE TWO EDITORS

On Astral Bodies, or Doppelgangers

M. C. Great confusion exists in the minds of people about the various kinds of apparitions, wraiths, ghosts or spirits. Ought we not to explain once for all the meaning of these terms? You say there are various kinds of "doubles"—what are they?

H. P. B. Our occult philosophy teaches us that there are three kinds of "doubles," to use the word in its widest sense. (I) Man has his "double" or *shadow,* properly so called, around which the physical body of the *fœtus*—the future man—is built. The imagination of the mother, or an accident which affects the child, will affect also the astral body. The astral and the physical both exist before the mind is developed into action, and before the Atma awakes. This occurs when the child is seven years old, and with it comes the responsibility attaching to a conscious sentient being. This "double" is born with man, dies with him and can never separate itself far from the body during life, and though surviving him, it disintegrates, *pari passu,* with the corpse. It is this which is sometimes seen over the graves like a luminous figure of the man that was, during certain atmospheric conditions. From its physical aspect it is, during life, *man's vital* double, and after death, only the gases given off from the decaying body. But, as regards its origin and essence, it is something more. This "double" is what we have agreed to call *lingasarira,* but which I would propose to call, for greater convenience, "Protean" or "Plastic Body."

M. C. Why Protean or Plastic?

H. P. B. Protean, because it can assume all forms; *e. g.* the "shepherd magicians" whom popular rumour accuses, perhaps not without some reason, of being "were-wolves," and "mediums in cabinets," whose own "Plastic Bodies" play the part of materialised grandmothers and "John Kings." Otherwise, why the invariable custom of the "dear departed angels" to come out but little further than arm's length from the medium, whether entranced or not? Mind, I do not at all deny foreign influences in this kind of phenomena. But I do affirm that foreign interference is rare, and that the materialised form is always that of the medium's *"Astral"* or Protean body.

M. C. But how is this astral body created?

H. P. B. It is not created; it grows, as I told you, with the man and exists in the rudimentary condition even before the child is born.

Note.—This article was first published by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer,* December, 1888.

M. C. And what about the second?

H. P. B. The second is the "Thought" body, or Dream body, rather; known among Occultists as the *Mayavi-rupa,* or "Illusion-body." During life this image is the vehicle both of thought and of the animal passions and desires, drawing at one and the same time from the lowest terrestrial *manas* (mind) and *Kama,* the element of desire. It is *dual* in its potentiality, and after death forms what is called in the East, *Bhoot,* or *Kama-rupa,* but which is better known to theosophists as the "Spook."

M. C. And the third?

H. P. B. The third is the true *Ego,* called in the East by a name meaning "causal body" but which in the *trans*-Himalayan schools is always called the "Karmic body," which is the same. For *Karma* or action is the cause which produces incessant rebirths or "reincarnations." It is *not* the *Monad,* nor is it Manas proper; but is, in a way, indissolubly connected with, and a compound of the Monad and Manas in Devachan.

M. C. Then there are three doubles?

H. P. B. If you can call the Christian and other Trinities "three Gods," then there are three doubles. But in truth there is only one under three aspects or phases: the most material portion disappearing with the body; the middle one, surviving both as an independent, but temporary entity in the land of shadows; the third, immortal, throughout the manvantara unless Nirvana puts an end to it before.

M. C. But shall not we be asked what difference there is between the *Mayavi* and *Kama rupa,* or as you propose to call them the "Dream body" and the "Spook"?

H. P. B. Most likely, and we shall answer, in addition to what has been said, that the "thought power" or aspect of the *Mayavi* or "Illusion body," merges after death entirely into the causal body or the conscious, *thinking* EGO. The animal elements, or power of desire of the "Dream body," absorbing after death that which it has collected (through its insatiable desire *to live*) during life; *i.e.,* all the astral vitality as well as all the impressions of its *material* acts and thoughts while it lived in possession of the body, forms the "Spook" or *Kama rupa.* Our Theosophists know well enough that after death the *higher* Manas unites with the *Monad* and passes into Devachan, while the dregs of the *lower manas* or animal mind go to form this Spook. This has life in it, but hardly any consciousness, except, as it were by proxy; when it is drawn into the current of a medium.

M. C. Is it all that can be said upon the subject?

H. P. B. For the present this is enough metaphysics, I guess. Let us hold to the "Double" in its earthly phase. What would you know?

M. C. Every country in the world believes more or less in the "double" or doppelganger. The simplest form of this is the appearance of a man's phantom, the moment after his death, or at the instant of death, to his dearest friend. Is this appearance the *mayavi rupa?*

H. P. B. It is; because produced by the thought of the dying man.

M. C. Is it unconscious?

H. P. B. It is unconscious to the extent that the dying man does not generally do it knowingly; nor is he aware that he so appears. What happens is this. If he thinks very intently at the moment of death of the person he either is very anxious to see, or loves best, he may appear to that person. The thought becomes objective; the double, or shadow of a man, being nothing but the faithful reproduction of him, like a reflection in a mirror, that which the man does, even in thought, that the double repeats. This is why the phantoms are often seen in such cases in the clothes they wear at the particular moment, and the *image* reproduces even the expression on the dying man's face. If the double of a man bathing were seen it would seem to be immersed in water; so when a man who has been drowned appears to his friend, the image will be seen to be dripping with water. The cause for the apparition may be also reversed; *i.e.*, the dying man may or may not be thinking at all of the particular person his image appears to, but it is that person who is sensitive. Or perhaps his sympathy or his hatred for the individual whose wraith is thus evoked is very intense physically or psychically; and in this case the apparition is created by, and depends upon, the intensity of the thought. What then happens is this. Let us call the dying man A, and him who sees the double B. The latter, owing to love, hate, or fear, has the image of A so deeply impressed on his psychic memory, that actual magnetic attraction and repulsion are established between the two, whether one knows of it and feels it, or not. When A dies, the sixth sense or psychic spiritual intelligence of the *inner man* in B becomes cognisant of the change in A, and forthwith apprizes the physical senses of the man, by projecting before his eye the form of A, as it is at the instant of the great change. The same when the dying man longs to see some one; *his* thought telegraphs to his friend, consciously or unconsciously along the wire of sympathy, and becomes objective. This is what the "Spookical" Research Society would pompously, but none the less muddily, call *telepathic impact.*

M. C. This applies to the simplest form of the appearance of the double. What about cases in which the double does that which is contrary to the feeling and wish of the man?

H. P. B. This is impossible. The "Double" cannot act, unless the keynote of this action was struck in the brain of the man to whom the "Double" belongs, be that man just dead, or alive, in good or in bad health. If he paused on the thought a second, long enough to give it form, before he passed on to other mental pictures, this one second is as sufficient for the *objectivizations* of his personality on the astral waves, as for your face to impress itself on the sensitized plate of a photographic apparatus. Nothing prevents your form, then, being seized upon by the surrounding Forces—as a dry leaf fallen from a tree is taken up and carried away by the wind—being made to caricature or distort your thought.

M. C. Supposing the double expresses in actual words a thought uncongenial to the man, and expresses it—let us say to a friend far away, perhaps on another continent? I have known instances of this occurring.

H. P. B. Because it then so happens that the created image is taken up and used by a "Shell." Just as in séance-rooms when "images" of the dead—which may perhaps be lingering unconsciously in the memory or even the auras of those present are seized upon by the Elementals or Elementary Shadows and made objective to the audience, and even caused to act at the bidding of the strongest of the many different wills in the room. In your case, moreover, there must exist a connecting link—a telegraph wire—between the two persons, a point of psychic sympathy, and on this the thought travels instantly. Of course there must be, in every case, some strong reason why that particular thought takes that direction; it must be connected in some way with the other person. Otherwise such apparitions would be of common and daily occurrence.

M. C. This seems very simple; why then does it only occur with exceptional persons?

H. P. B. Because the plastic power of the imagination is much stronger in some persons than in others. The mind is dual in its potentiality: It is physical and metaphysical. The higher part of the mind is connected with the spiritual soul or Buddhi, the lower with the animal soul, the Kama principle. There are persons who never think with the higher faculties of their mind at all; those who do so are the minority and are thus, in a way, *beyond,* if not above, the

average of human kind. These will think even upon ordinary matters on that *higher* plane. The idiosyncracy of the person determines in which "principle" of the mind the thinking is done, as also the faculties of a preceding life, and sometimes the heredity of the physical. This is why it is so very difficult for a materialist—the metaphysical portion of whose brain is almost atrophied—to raise himself, or for one who is naturally spiritually minded, to descend to the level of the matter-of-fact vulgar thought. Optimism and pessimism depend on it also in a large measure.

M. C. But the habit of thinking in the higher mind can be developed—else there would be no hope for persons who wish to alter their lives and raise themselves? And that this is possible must be true, or there would be no hope for the world.

H. P. B. Certainly it can be developed, but only with great difficulty, a firm determination, and through much self-sacrifice. But it is comparatively easy for those who are born with the gift. Why is it that one person sees poetry in a cabbage or a pig with her little ones, while another will perceive in the loftiest things only their lowest and most material aspect, will laugh at the "music of the spheres," and ridicule the most sublime conceptions and philosophies? This difference depends simply on the innate power of the mind to think on the higher or on the lower plane, with the *astral* (in the sense given to the word by St. Martin), or with the physical brain. Great intellectual powers are often no proof of, but are impediments to spiritual and right conceptions; witness most of the great men of science. We must rather pity than blame them.

M. C. But how is it that the person who thinks on the higher plane produces more perfect and more potential images and objective forms by his thought?

H. P. B. Not necessarily that "person" alone, but all those who are generally sensitives. The person who is endowed with this faculty of thinking about even the most trifling things from the higher plane of thought has, by virtue of that gift which he possesses, a plastic power of formation, so to say, in his very imagination. Whatever such a person may think about, his thought will be so far more intense than the thought of an ordinary person, that by this very intensity it obtains the power of creation. Science has established the fact that thought is an energy. This energy in its action disturbs the atoms of the astral atmosphere around us. I already told you; the rays of thought have the same potentiality for producing forms in the astral atmosphere as the sunrays have with regard to a lens.

Every thought so evolved with energy from the brain, creates *nolens volens* a shape.

M. C. Is that shape absolutely unconscious?

H. P. B. Perfectly unconscious unless it is the creation of an adept, who has a pre-conceived object in giving it consciousness, or rather in sending along with it enough of his will and intelligence to cause it to appear conscious. This ought to make us more cautious about our thoughts.

But the wide distinction that obtains between the adept in this matter and the ordinary man must be borne in mind. The adept may at his will use his *Mayavi rupa,* but the ordinary man does not, except in very rare cases. It is called *Mayavi rupa* because it is a form of illusion created for use in the particular instance, and it has quite enough of the adept's mind in it to accomplish its purpose. The ordinary man merely creates a thought-image, whose properties and powers are at the time wholly unknown to him.

M. C. Then one may say that the form of an adept appearing at a distance from his body, as for instance Ram Lal in *Mr. Isaacs,* is simply an image?

H. P. B. Exactly. It is a walking thought.

M. C. In which case an adept can appear in several places almost simultaneously.

H. P. B. He can. Just as Apollonius of Tyana, who was seen in two places at once, while his body was at Rome. But it must be understood that not *all* of even the *astral* adept is present in each appearance.

M. C. Then it is very necessary for a person of any amount of imagination and psychic powers to attend to their thoughts?

H. P. B. Certainly, for each thought has a shape which borrows the appearance of the man engaged in the action of which he thought. Otherwise how can clairvoyants see in your *aura* your past and present? What they see is a passing panorama of yourself represented in successive actions by your thoughts. You asked me if we are punished for our thoughts. Not for all, for some are still-born; but for the others, those which we call "silent" but potential thoughts —yes. Take an extreme case, such as that of a person who is so wicked as to wish the death of another. Unless the evil-wisher is a *Dugpa,* a high adept in black magic, in which case Karma is delayed, such a wish only comes back to roost.

M. C. But supposing the evil-wisher to have a very strong will, without being a *dugpa,* could the death of the other be accomplished?

H. P. B. Only if the malicious person has the evil eye, which simply means possessing enormous plastic power of imagination working involuntarily, and thus turned unconsciously to bad uses. For what is the power of the "evil eye"? Simply a great plastic power of thought, so great as to produce a current impregnated with the potentiality of every kind of misfortune and accident, which inoculates, or attaches itself to any person who comes within it. A *jettatore* (one with the evil eye) need not be even imaginative, or have evil intentions or wishes. He may be simply a person who is naturally fond of witnessing or reading about sensational scenes, such as murder, executions, accidents, etc., etc. He may be not even thinking of any of these at the moment his eye meets his future victim. But the currents have been produced and exist in his visual ray ready to spring into activity the instant they find suitable soil, like a seed fallen by the way and ready to sprout at the first opportunity.

M. C. But how about the thoughts you call "silent"? Do such wishes or thoughts come home to roost?

H. P. B. They do; just as a ball which fails to penetrate an object rebounds upon the thrower. This happens even to some *dugpas* or sorcerers who are not strong enough, or do not comply with the rules—for even they have *rules* they have to abide by—but not with those who are regular, fully developed "black magicians"; for such have the power to accomplish what they wish.

M. C. When you speak of rules it makes me want to wind up this talk by asking you what everybody wants to know who takes any interest in occultism. What is a principal or important suggestion for those who have these powers and wish to control them rightly—in fact to enter occultism?

H. P. B. The first and most important step in occultism is to learn how to adapt your thoughts and ideas to your plastic potency.

M. C. Why is this so important?

H. P. B. Because otherwise you are creating things by which you may be making bad Karma. No one should go into occultism or even touch it before he is perfectly acquainted with his own powers, and that he knows how to commensurate it with his actions. And this he can do only by deeply studying the philosophy of Occultism before entering upon the *practical* training. Otherwise, as sure as fate—HE WILL FALL INTO BLACK MAGIC.

CYCLES OF PSYCHISM

V

IT is quite evident to everyone who reads the newspapers and magazines of the day, and who notes the character of books being published for popular circulation, that there is a growing interest in so-called "psychic" subjects. The rigidly materialistic outlook of yesterday's science, once regarded by most people as the final authority in all important questions, no longer prevails—a change in attitude which is as much due to the philosophical, even mystical, tendencies among leading scientists themselves as to anything else. The vast unexplored area of supernormal psychological powers resident in man is receiving the attention of orthodox scientific investigators, and these workers, while not without their opponents, are slowly gaining the approbation of thoughtful men and women. Concurrently with these developments in the scientific and academic world has come a renascence of popular interest in the "occult," the mysterious and the supernatural. Although lacking the scholarly sanction of modern university authorities, this widespread attraction to psychic wonders, spiritualistic phenomena and the like is far more significant of the trend of human thought and activity than the erudite and guarded speculations of a few scientists. Some broad tendency of human nature is gradually emerging, finding expression through various channels and at different levels of intelligence. So numerous are the indications of this change in attitude, and so far-reaching its effects on modern life, that one is justified in proposing the question: Is it mere coincidence that men and women in all walks of life are turning to the psychic and occult, whether it be for purposes of religious satisfaction, scientific inquiry, or even amusement, or can there be discerned some unifying principle, some broad psychological conception which will account for this almost universal trend?

Perhaps the most telling indication of the supremacy of psychism lies in its negative aspect—the breakdown of the rational method of dealing with human problems. This we find to a startling degree in recent political events in Europe. Democracy, which is the spirit of rationalism embodied in government forms, is a thing of the past on the European continent. Germany is governed by mystical inspiration, by a modern prophet of Teutonic destiny whose word is on a par with religious revelation. Only a little less frenzied is the rule of the reincarnated Caesar of Italy. During the Middle Ages, Philosophy, as historians have said, was the handmaiden of Theology.

Now, in the modern age, Science, which was to have been the liberator of all mankind, has taken its place beside both Theology and Philosophy, and all three minister to that supremely emotional entity, the Corporate State. The utterances of the dictator are oracular and final for many millions who have abrogated their right of independent thinking.

In America, the religious groups which have been most successful in gaining adherents in recent years are those which relegate reason to an unimportant position in the scheme of moral life. There is, for example, the Oxford Movement headed by Dr. Frank Buchman. The Buchmanites "talk with God." God tells them what to do. This, of course, makes everything very simple, once you get a wire through to the supreme Deity. One need not think for himself when one has God for his personal *daimon*. "God has a Plan," say the Oxford enthusiasts, untroubled by the searching investigations of philosophers who have not as yet been able to convince either themselves or anyone of intelligence that a personal, thinking and planning "being" can at the same time be omnipresent and universal—the highest there is. The ethics of the Oxford Movement are indeed admirable—Absolute Love, Charity, Honesty, Truthfulness—but one cannot help remembering that the same Robespierre who as head of the Committee of Public Safety in the Paris Commune murdered thirty men a day, twelve years previously had retired from the judge's bench in the city of Arras because his conscience would not permit him to pronounce the sentence of death. What if God's plan should change? The crusades were one of "His" designs, and so was the Spanish Inquisition.

What of the hundreds of oriental seers, yogis and "spiritual teachers" who have invaded the shores of America during recent years, gaining for themselves immense personal followings? Almost without exception, their prospectuses read, "Gain health, wealth, happiness by this new, easy, *secret* method! Develop your will, your secret powers, by learning from *me!*" The emotional exaltation produced in the devotees of these pseudo-spiritual teachers often ends in insanity and it cannot fail to warp the intellectual powers almost beyond repair. The native sages and prophets are not less numerous, nor less wily in their methods of exploiting the religious nature of their fellow men. Correspondence courses in spiritual development do a thriving business. The ignorant, the naïve and the miserable pay an annual toll of millions of dollars to purchase the "secrets of the ages." There is literally nothing that these merchants of psychic glory will not promise for a modest fee.

There is no index of modern psychism superior to the magazine news-stand. Psychic Science, Mysticism, Psychology, Spiritualism, Astrology, Mental Healing, Hypnotism—these are but a few general labels to indicate the contents of scores of national magazines with aggregate circulations running into many millions. The appetite of the wonder-seeking psychic is insatiable. Nothing but the promise of new and more mysterious miracles will satisfy. Garnished with terms borrowed from the vocabulary of both science and religion, often spiced with veiled sex appeal, written in the sensational style of yellow journalism, these publications cater to the most susceptible area of human nature—the psycho-religious hunger for miracles, for personal salvation, personal power and aggrandisement. More insidious than frank prostitution of the body, the panderers to psychic intoxication are perverting minds and souls *en masse*.

There are affinities between these psychic periodicals and the numerous picture magazines which have recently flooded the country. The latter are essentially "psychic" in character, holding the attention of the reader through a vivid sense impression instead of intellectual content. The reading matter is succinct, definitive, and impresses the mind of the reader with conclusions which he rarely questions. No thought is required of the picture-magazine fan; he sees, is entertained, and he believes. Actually, the picture magazines have appropriated a technique carefully developed through many years of experience by advertising experts. Picture magazines use the same principles of attention-getting, fascination, and conversion to the "message" of the advertiser that have made fortunes for so many of these exploiters of the foibles and weaknesses of human nature—the *psychic* nature. The methods of the radio advertiser are similar, the only difference lying in the fact that the impression is auditory instead of visual. The oily, patronizing tones of the announcers—little better than confidence men who have been naturalized into respectability by the "bigness" of the business enterprises they represent, and by the degrading standards of commercial honesty which we accept unthinkingly—lull the listeners into passive acquiescence. It is all so easy, so effortless! Moving pictures combine both auditory and visual impressions to make wish-fulfillment dreams for the masses. This is Hollywood's contribution to the stultification of independent thought in America and elsewhere. Why should—*how can*—men think, be rational, or survive as a democratic society, when practically all of their leisure time is spent in absorbing, like so many psychic sponges, the persuasive and

sensation-producing sights and sounds readily provided by the "practical" psychologists of this psychic dispensation?

A catalogue of the various brands of psychic intoxicants could be continued indefinitely. The gamut of emotionalism in modern life includes the familiar exhortations of the revivalist and the responding ecstasy of his listeners; the uninhibited abandon of youthful swing enthusiasts in their dervish frenzy; the tense appeals of political partisans arousing the dogs of class hatred, the clamor of unsatisfied greed, and all the springs of outraged selfishness on which the demagogue depends for his success. Wherever there is human action based on the instinctive drives of the animal man, on the hunger for sensations, on the satisfaction of desires without regard for the consequences, there is psychism unleashed and enthroned. When the psychic nature reigns, reason never serves as a check, being called upon only to justify, to *rationalize* the fiats of the emotions.

What are the consequences of an unregulated emotional life? Of imagination or fantasy run wild? Of dabbling in "magic," in spiritualism and the "occult arts"? Ask a psychiatrist this question, and, ignorant as he may be of the realities which these labels conceal, he will relate horrors that would make the tales of Poe sound like bedtime stories. A writer in *Harper's* recently described our time as "The Age of Schizophrenia," of split-personality, so named because of the splitting apart of the emotional from the intellectual life which characterizes the mental state of literally millions of people. We learn that "schizophrenic patients occupy one-fifth of all the hospital beds in the United States, reckoning in general hospital as well as in mental hospital beds." Turn to the literature of psychiatry on the subject of "Obsession," a term retained from the theories of obsessing demons believed in in the Dark Ages, and see what proportion of the victims of this kind of insanity are or have been spiritualists or mediumistically inclined. Find, if you can, the line between religious fanaticism and actual madness. In the wake of the visiting yogis and psychic seers are to be found human beings with emotionally shattered lives. They were told that a certain kind of breathing would bring them knowledge—they would "see things." They did the breathing exercises, and now they can't stop seeing things, are going crazy, or have gone. Others, who thought Hatha Yoga was "spiritual," find that their organisms break down under the insidious discipline. In many such cases, insanity may be a blessing in disguise, deferring until a later incarnation the moral trial which may then come at a time when the character of the victim has grown stronger and more able to withstand psychic temptations.

The hazards of Hatha Yoga are undreamed of by the average westerner. A few years ago, an English writer, Gerald Heard, spoke of breathing exercises as "the most instant and powerful of all the physical methods of affecting, altering and enlarging consciousness." While tempering this judgment with some warnings against the consequences of this physical kind of "yoga," he adds that "it is a risk we have no choice except to take."

For those who are attracted to taking this "risk," the following experiment, conducted by Wm. Q. Judge, is described. Mr. Judge wrote:

> The persons present were myself, a well-known physician whose name I can give, and the practitioner. The physician first took the person's pulse for three minutes and found it to be running at ninety-six beats per minute; and then the experiment began with the practice with the following result:
>
> First minute. Pulse fell to 91 beats.
> Second minute. Pulse fell to 81 beats.
> Third minute. Pulse remained at 81 beats.
>
> A delay of five minutes then occurred, when the practice was begun again for six minutes, with the following result:
>
> First minute. Pulse running at 91 beats a minute.
> Second minute. Pulse fell to 86 beats.
> Third minute. Pulse remained at 86.
> Fourth minute. Pulse fell to 76.
> Fifth minute. Remained at 76.
> Sixth minute. Remained at 76.
>
> This shows a reduction in the pulse action of twenty beats in fourteen minutes. It also shows that after the first three minutes the intermission of five minutes was not enough to enable the pulse to go back to ninety-six beats, at which it started. The first three minutes showed a fall of five beats in the first minute and ten in the next minute, making fifteen beats reduction for the three minutes.
>
> It therefore appears that one of the accompaniments of this practice is a distinct effect upon the action of the heart, and as all the Hindu books invariably state that great caution should be used and that there are dangers, we can see here a very great danger found in an effect upon the heart's action, resulting in a reduction of pulse beats of twenty beats in fourteen minutes. The Hindu books to which I have referred, and which are the only works through which inquirers have heard about these practices, also say that a guide who is fully acquainted with the subject is necessary for each student, and that every one of these practices requires an antidote for its effects through other regulations tending to neutralize the bad physical effects. Students have been too anxious to try these experiments

> without paying any attention to the cautions given out, and I know of some cases in which, while well remembering that the cautions had been uttered, persons have pursued these practices by themselves without assistance.

Discussing so-called "practical yoga" in another place, Mr. Judge called attention to the fact that the directions found in the *Upanishads,* with regard to breathing and postural exercises, should never be practiced except under the following conditions: (a) a complete knowledge of all the consequences, with a knowledge of correctives to be applied when changes take place; and (b) the possession of a thoroughly competent guide to point out errors, to restrain endeavour and to indicate danger, as well as to cure troubles that ensue.

Yet in the face of all this, and of repeated warnings, there are those who will foolhardily begin the practices in complete ignorance. They do not even pursue the ethical regulations that accompany all the others, such as the doing away with all vices, bad habits, uncharitable thoughts and so on; but go in for the practices, merely in the hope of procuring psychic powers. It is time it were stopped, and time that those who give out this literature looked into what they give out to a grasping and stiff-necked generation. That damage has been wrought cannot be contested, in face of actual experience.

It is well known that these postures, even when ignorantly used, bring on physiological changes in the body, with great nervous derangements.

The need of the West is not for Hatha Yoga, but of that other and higher discipline, known in the Orient as *Raja* Yoga. Hatha Yoga is a practical mortification of the body, by means of which certain powers are developed. Raja Yoga, on the other hand, discards those physical motions, postures and recipes relating solely to the present personality, and directs the student to virtue and altruism as the bases from which to start. Besides the higher objective presented by Raja Yoga, there is the enormous danger which the western student exposes himself to by attempting Hatha yogic development. Even though he may follow rules given by a teacher more or less informed, he will inevitably arouse about him influences that do him harm, and he also carries his natural functions to certain states now and then when he ought to stop for a while, but, having no knowledge of the matter, may go on beyond and produce injurious effects. The greatest objection to it, however, is that it pertains to the material and semi-material man,—roughly, to the body, and what is gained through it is lost at death.

"NATURE"

THE word "Nature" in its real sense should include all that is. But man tends to separate his own works from those of nature, and hence to distinguish himself by implication from the other "forces of nature." There is, however, no fundamentally scientific reason for considering a tree more "natural" than a house.

The mental separation exists in men of all tastes and characters. To some, "nature" is that which is to be left alone in its own growth, to be admired and imitated, or gently fostered. To others, "nature" is merely an inconvenient chaos to be circumvented, ordered, eliminated, or exploited for profit. To "nature-lovers," the processes of unhampered nature are superior. To others, nothing is really sacred. To neither is man himself an integral part of nature.

Theosophy shows that "nature" is simply an infinite ladder of sentient evolution composed of intelligence at all levels, necessarily containing high degrees of imperfection as well as perfection. Man himself is a composition of such intelligences, and both the partial views above described are thus aside from the truth. In the light of understanding, neither the abuse nor the worship of nature is possible, and the line drawn between a tree and a house vanishes. There are relatively perfect and imperfect trees according to the intelligence involved, as there are relatively perfect and imperfect houses, and for the same reason—relatively perfect and imperfect intelligence.

Few if any species of plants or animals are "perfect" in the sense of being wholly adapted to their environment. Enormous waste is involved in the mere machinery of procreation of all these forms of life. Least of all is life in the animal kingdom and above it "perfect" in capacity to avoid suffering, which presumably should be the criterion of perfection.

Religion dreams of a mystic "perfection" whose manifest imperfections are shrouded in mystery, or it sets God apart and hands Nature over to the devil. In scientific thought the conception of perfection versus imperfection tends to vanish out of the macrocosmos and sift down at last to the minutely perfect arrangements of atoms and their electrons. But if investigation were carried far enough, it would be found that even in this realm there is high individuality as between seemingly identical phenomena, hence again the ever-recurring riddle of relative perfection. Embedded in the stones are innumerable samples of past mistakes of nature, in the forms of species which vanished to give place to others.

Of late years it has begun to dawn on the "Lord of Creation" that he himself might conceivably be one of nature's mistakes, fated to give way to a higher form of life. This is fast coming to be more than the joke it was considered when first broached. Not so long ago a professor of biology seriously advanced the view that what we call "civilization" is actually a true disease, a form of neurosis. It is unfortunately true that those diseases involving mental derangement are not regarded by the victim as diseases at all, but as superior forms of health. This psychosis is very obvious in the attitude of superiority assumed by the self-destructive cultures of the West and of Westernized Japan toward simpler and milder ways of life.

Once that the way is opened for this new critical view of man himself as a possibly inferior being, probably self-doomed, the way is also open for more drastic recognition of his defects. The great obstacle that Theosophy has always met is resistance to its insistence that human nature is full of corruptions and perversions which must be cured. The more palatable view holds that man is merely somewhat imperfect but certain to improve indefinitely.

Theosophy shows that the proud privilege claimed by man, of satisfying his sexual desires without restraint, regard to season, or responsibility, in which respect he prides himself as being much superior to the poor unsophisticated animal, actually springs from mental disease, produces and is produced by physical disease. Thus it represents retrograde evolution—degeneration—like any other function used for personal enjoyment alone. The same is true—perhaps even more so—of drinking. Neither is any more "natural" than taking morphine. War, though held praiseworthy—given due "provocation"—by the bulk of Western mankind, has no more "natural" basis than any of these.

Going deeper, hatred and anger in man are *wholly unnatural;* they are borrowed from the lower kingdoms, and have a peculiarly deadly effect on man himself. The external appearance of anger and fear in the animal is simply the natural biological reaction induced by the glandular activities necessary to adjustment to specific circumstances of hunger, self-defense, etc. The engendered secretions are worked off harmlessly, leaving no physical aftermath and no mental accumulation. The animal is incapable of harbored revenge.

The terrible union between the imaginative mind of man and his unchecked physical passions places the human reaction on a superior, hence more disastrous plane. A man cannot give way to anger without marking himself for life, both mentally and physically; and many arrive at the grave mere masses of scar tissue.

Man's sex instinct is desecrated and abused, with the result that man is "the wealthiest heir on the globe to constitutional and hereditary diseases, the most consciously and intelligently bestial of all animals!" These passions haunt, pollute and poison his mind and body.

The unique position of man on the ladder of evolution arises from the linkage in him of a spiritual self and an animal self. Thus is created a perpetual battle in which there can be only one final winner—the material powers must be absorbed into the spiritual, or vice versa. It is the prevalence of the latter case in this age that causes the miseries of man. Corruption has gone on for a long time —for so many geological ages that it has been accepted as the norm. This is the grim fact that must be faced by mankind during a long future; modern "liberal" ideas only create new obstacles.

However, the winning of victory in one sector of the *Kama* or desire nature weakens it in every direction. Greed, hate, lust, and fear are not separate properties but are all roots of the same plant—the plant of glossy leaves and seemingly succulent fruit that grows in moral and physical decay and in turn creates further ruin. Let him who finds himself karmically bedeviled with seeming deprivations of desire accept them willingly, and reach the goal sooner over the matting of dead weeds that, living, he mistook for the flowers of life.

THE DAWN OF DEVOTION

During its early beginnings, psychic and physical intellect being dormant and consciousness still undeveloped, the spiritual conceptions of the race were quite unconnected with its physical surroundings. That *divine* man dwelt in his animal—though externally human—form; and, if there was instinct in him, no self-consciousness came to enlighten the darkness of the latent fifth principle. When, moved by the law of Evolution, the Lords of Wisdom infused into him the spark of consciousness, the first feeling it awoke to life and activity was a sense of solidarity, of oneness with his spiritual creators. As the child's first feeling is for its mother and nurse, so the first aspirations of the awakening consciousness in primitive man were for those whose element he felt within himself, and who yet were outside, and independent of him. DEVOTION arose out of that feeling, and became the first and foremost motor of his nature; for it is the only one which is natural to our heart, which is innate in us, and which we find alike in human babe and the young of the animal.

—H. P. B.

SCIENCE NEWS AND NOTES

"Postulates of Impotence"

FOR the latest assay to solve the inscrutable problem of fate and free will, we are indebted to Dr. Henry Norris Russell of Princeton University Observatory. (*Science*, March 19.) Dr. Russell opens with some considerations on the real nature of the "uncertainty principle" which justify reviewing.

> There is [he writes] an old saying concerning the Christian ministry. "Every man must be an Arminian when he preaches, and a Calvinist when he prays." . . . In the first case he must emphasize free-will; and in the second, divine providence . . . an effective statement of an intellectual difficulty which besets religion, philosophy and science alike. Even the most case-hardened mechanist of the old nineteenth-century school had no qualms about asking his neighbor to pass the butter.

Of course, to try to segregate actions does not help in the least. A man has to use his will when he prays as well as when he preaches; more so when praying an original prayer than when preaching another man's sermon. The problem is too naïvely conceived by those who would solve it!

> It is bold to attempt even a partial resolution of this ancient antinomy; but I am convinced that it may be very considerably clarified with the aid of concepts derived from physical science.

We find ourselves more than skeptical about the possible clarification of any metaphysical problem by the concepts of physical science, and at the end of Dr. Russell's discussion we find this skepticism quite unabated. But the intervening struggle of the well-meaning scientific fly caught in the molasses of the cosmic enigma is well worth study.

> . . . voices of protest would rise here. "Have you forgotten Heisenberg?" "Has not modern physics abandoned determinism, and committed itself to a principle of indeterminacy?" . . . It is not only in past centuries that mischief has been done by the unfortunate choice of a name. If the great physicist who discovered the "uncertainty principle" had only called it the "Principle of limited measurability" . . . we might have been spared a great part of the "awful outbreak of intellectual licentiousness" which Bridgman all too truly foresaw among the half-informed.
>
> The principle is of the type which Whittaker has recently called Postulates of Impotence.

Such an apt expression in this connection is veritably a miracle of fitness. Dr. Russell explains what every thoughtful man should have seen from the first, but what many scientists did not see for years: that the inability to predict an action does not mean that the action is undetermined.

> The difficulty arises from the fact that the means of measurement themselves cannot be refined to absolute perfection, because nature is not fine-grained enough. Matter, electricity and radiant energy all come in discrete packets . . . and no experiment can be made upon a single one of them except by hitting it with another, and thereby seriously disturbing the situation which we desired to study and measure.
>
> There are many things which we . . . would dearly love to find out that nature won't let us—for example, what was the difference between the atom of radium which blew up last second and its neighbor, which will go on for centuries. . . .

Here is the impasse confronting material science in every direction—the impossibility of analyzing a thing without disturbing it. It applies to the electron, to the animal on the vivisectionist's table, and to the mind of man itself. If the experimenter does not hit the object of his investigation with another such object, he at least hits it with his prejudices and preconceptions. But there is another and entirely different road to knowledge, not subject to this limitation, although the physical scientist can neither comprehend its nature nor make the sacrifices necessary to follow it. It is the path of Occult Science.

Dr. Russell is correct in stating that inability to find a reason why one atom explodes before another does not mean that no reason exists. There must be a reason, he claims, but because of its elusiveness to research, the reason is "not physics." So far as science is concerned, the reason lies in the regions of agnosticism. This sort of agnosticism, scientific agnosticism, is different from the religious variety. If a method be found by which a scientist could tell physically why the one atom blew up while the other did not, he would accept it. The religious agnostic, on the other hand, resents the idea that anything presently unknown to him can ever be known by anyone. This may seem a harsh characterization, but we think it will be concurred in by almost anyone who has argued with an "agnostic." "Agnosticism" is, in the great majority of cases, simply a cloak for blank and determined negation, and usually for outright materialistic atheism.

> One conclusion is clear. The nineteenth-century image of a vast, though finite, intelligence, which could determine at a given instant the exact positions and velocities of every particle . . . and thus be enabled to predict with absolute accuracy the whole future history of the universe, is also "not physics."

But Dr. Russell does not convince us that *if* such a mind *did* exist, it could not make such a prediction; in other words, such an argument cannot lead to any conception of free will. We fear that he cannot escape the barbed wire of determinism without admitting the presence of *volition* in *every particle in space.*

As a case of a true indeterminist, Dr. Russell puts forth an Arab who, when asked the average age of a palm tree, replied that only on the day of Judgment could it be known what time Allah had assigned as the average age of a palm tree. "Here is the true Indeterminist—an educated man, believing in an almighty, just and compassionate, though somewhat arbitrary God—but not in the law of averages," writes Dr. Russell.

On the contrary, this Arab appears to us to be a determinist *par excellence.* It further appears to us that the God of Dr. Russell is quite as almighty and arbitrary as the Allah of the Arab; the main difference being that Dr. Russell has confidence in the possibility of ascertaining the Divine Will by the practicable process of addition and division, without waiting for the Day of Judgment.

> There is very strong evidence that . . . the distribution of the results of large numbers (of quantum jumps) is strictly governed by the laws of probability . . . the statistical fluctuations in the averages of successive similar trials shrink below the limits of the best measurements and individual uncertainty is transformed into practical certainty.

Here Dr. Russell really "has something." The demonstrated capacity of an Adept for predicting world events and national events in the mass, arises from just such a law as he points out. If one comprehends the behavior of enough people, he is able to determine how people will act, even though individual human nature, in the words of a Great Teacher himself, remains "unfathomable." The profound mystery which remains for science—and to a large degree remains for even the highest being—is, which course will be taken by any specific unit? This mystery remains because it is rooted in the unfathomable cosmic volition of which the individual will is a part, and "into which no man or mind, however high, can inquire."

We are profoundly grateful to Dr. Russell for disposing of one of the hoariest and most disastrous items of materialist mythology which has grown up during the last century or so.

> Take a very simple case—a glass globe containing 100 small smooth balls, just alike except that 50 of them are white and 50 yellow. If the globe is thoroughly shaken and set down, the balls will settle into a circular patch at the bottom. It might happen, by pure chance, that all the white balls fell into the north half of this patch, and all the yellow ones into the south half; but the probability of this is . . . approximately one chance in 1,126,000,000,000,000.

A calculation will show that if the process could be repeated every second, such a distribution might be arrived at in about 36,000,000 years. Moreover, it has long ago been determined that the likelihood of such a distribution is no greater after the 35,999,999th year than it was after the first. This half-and-half distribution is about as simple a possibility in a definite configuration as can be imagined. If any man still believes in the nineteenth century dogma that "a group of monkeys striking typewriter keys at random would ultimately write the Encyclopedia Britannica by pure chance," we suggest that he get his bowl of white and yellow marbles and start on the letter "A." Such an occupation might not be strikingly useful, but it would at least keep him out of mischief.

At this point, however, Dr. Russell himself falls into a maelstrom of contradictions in which he finds himself grasping at bedraggled straws.

> The mechanistic hypothesis of the nature of man (in the statistical sense described above) is not an enemy, but an ally, of morals and religion. . . . On the mechanistic hypothesis, the determinism enters through the structure of the underlying system, while freedom and responsibility are statistical properties of the assemblage, man.

Yet have we not just been told that it is the *statistical average* that can be predicted, hence must be determinable?

> But the insistent problem, in times like these, is religious. There is no scientific difficulty in the belief that God, if He exists, controls the universe completely. [But there is considerable scientific difficulty in conceiving that such a God *does exist.*] Postulates of impotence need not be made concerning the Deity. [Not if we are willing to substitute therefor postulates of evil.] It is hard to believe that a morally perfect God controls the world in which we struggle. [Why try?] But if we deny this—if God is not all-

> powerful—if the evil wills of "the rulers of the darkness of this world" are outside His control, then the victims of oppression are indeed of all men most miserable, and there is no ultimate security anywhere. If we have any religion at all, we will pray in these days—and it is to God Almighty that we must pray. This faith—that God knows why He made the world this way, though we do not—has supported those who "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness . . . turned to flight the armies of the aliens." We need it desperately to-day, and we need equally faith in freedom.
>
> May we not have both, and be spared one more chapter of the weary history of the warfare of science and theology, if we accept, tentatively at least, a mechanistic but statistical hypothesis of our own nature?

It is gratifying to see an indication that science and theology are growing weary. Perhaps the weariness will increase to the point where they will leave the question of fate and free will to better-qualified minds; or possibly they might arrange that their representatives have some contact with at least freshman philosophy before discussing such issues. The difficulties in the last-quoted paragraph could be easily resolved by recognizing that those who "subdued kingdoms and wrought righteousness" of old were merely bent on shameless seizure of the lands and goods of others, made over to them by imaginary tribal gods, and in bigoted subjugation of the "heathen"; and are now back on earth, reincarnated as the "victims of oppression" to learn at last in the "hard way" the lessons they would not learn in any other way.

An almighty God and a merciful God are mutually exclusive propositions, in the face of the conditions that exist, and for ages have existed, in the world. If we are to postulate a God at all, under the circumstances, common prudence would suggest that we avoid His attention, and particularly eschew any such pointed attempts as prayer, especially since answers to prayers are highly undependable.

Dr. Russell caps his pyramid of confusion with one last stone askew:

> We have indeed to make one sacrifice; we will no longer be inclined to think of ourselves as irreducible spiritual units possessing some sort of ultimate reality independent of all else but God. But this hurts only our pride—and is likely to be good for us.

Thus, science and theology having drunk deep of the cup of man's supposed helplessness and separateness, and having found the dregs bitter as death—a kind of death itself—a representative of both calls for the deadly drug in still vaster measure.

One of the eternal mysteries of Kama-Manas is found in the following near approach to truth, from which Dr. Russell thereafter descends to final philosophical limbo:

> The trouble comes from introducing determinism and rejecting freedom and responsibility while retaining other concepts belonging to the higher level, such as consciousness and personality. It is imaginable that to some vast Intellect, which saw through the desperate complexity of our nature, responsibility and freedom would be replaced by deterministic concepts, intricate beyond our very imagining. But there is every reason to suppose that personality and consciousness would also be replaced by similar unimaginables. To such an Intellect men might not appear to be persons either. Least of all would they be conscious automata.

The mind of a Mahatma already includes this view, to say nothing of still higher Beings on the ladder of evolution. To such Intellects men are indeed neither persons nor "conscious automata," but the multiple expression of a single Spirit. The problem of fate and free will must remain forever insoluble in terms of personality. Those who transcend personality do not "solve" it either; it is merely seen by Them to be meaningless because based on a fundamental misconception of the nature of existence. The eternal verity of Karma (Free will *and* Fate) can be simply stated: Every being in the Universe, "from the minutest conceivable atom up to Brahma," has the innate power to *act, i.e.,* to set up causes. This *is* Free will. But *no* being has the power to control the effects and causes thus set up. *This* is Fate.

The Wisdom of Karma

For the Materialist, who calls the law of periodicity which regulates the marshalling of the several bodies, and all the other laws in nature, blind forces and mechanical laws, no doubt Karma would be a law of chance and no more. For us, no adjective or qualification could describe that which is impersonal and no entity, but a universal operative law. If you question me about the causative intelligence in it, I must answer you I do not know. But if you ask me to define its effects and tell you what these are in our belief, I may say that the experience of thousands of ages has shown us that they are absolute and unerring *equity, wisdom* and *intelligence.* For Karma in its effects is an unfailing redresser of human injustice, and of all the failures of nature; a stern adjuster of wrongs; a retributive law which rewards and punishes with equal impartiality.—H. P. B.

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

BOB, with determination fixed for battle, accosted Dave in the library, drew him to a bench and sat down. "Look here, Dave," he began, "here on page three." In Bob's hand was *The Ocean of Theosophy* Dave had given him. Bob had the book open and his finger pointed to the top of page three. "You said everyone can prove Theosophy for himself," Bob began. "No. If I remember correctly, you put it even stronger than that. You said each one *had* to prove it for himself. But right here it tells about people who live on Venus, who are 'brighter' than we are. Now, how am I supposed to prove that? I've never been to Venus, never met anyone who has, and never even read of any scientist telling what kind of people live there."

"Well, Bob," replied Dave good-humoredly, "I know you don't expect *me* to prove it to you, because all I know of Venus is what I see in the sky. But perhaps we can figure out where the idea came from in the first place. Since you have the *Ocean* right there, let's look at these first few pages for a minute. Let me point out the phrase that introduces, in a way, the statement about Venus. Here on page two, it says, 'Pushing further on by the light of the confidence had in his teachers. . . . ' That is really what brings up the question of Venus, because Mr. Judge just begins there, and one planet leads to another, so to say.

"Now, that little phrase is also a preface to the paragraph on the elder brothers, an extremely important passage. As a matter of fact, everything said on the first pages of the *Ocean* is in preparation for this paragraph on page three. If you don't reach it with an open mind, it isn't the author's fault, for he has carefully indicated that both religion and science fall short of being absolute truth. Both leave out some of the laws of life in favor of certain beliefs and dogmas, while Theosophy, he says, is simply knowledge of the laws governing the evolution of nature and man. Then he speaks of the soul of man, the intelligence in all nature, the development and experience of the soul, and finally of great Souls whose intelligence far exceeds our own."

"That's the same thing he said about the Venus people, isn't it!" exclaimed Bob.

"Yes," agreed Dave, "except that he doesn't say 'people.' He says 'entities'."

"Oh, well, entities are people, aren't they? What difference does it make what you call them?"

"Might not make any difference to you," Dave said. "But it must have made a difference to Mr. Judge, or he wouldn't have used one word instead of another. He was a lawyer, remember, and he knew the power of words. Besides that, he had a habit of checking up the real meaning of a term. He once wrote a friend that words are traps, and should be watched. He tried to encourage a careful use of language, and to make people look through words to ideas. So, if he used the word 'entities,' when speaking of the inhabitants of Venus, we shall assume he had a reason, and look to see what it could be. In the first place, the word 'people' means beings like ourselves. But, although we know little about life on Venus, it couldn't be the same as life on earth, because Venus is nearer the sun. The inhabitants of Venus might not even have bodies like ours, for all we know. And Mr. Judge says we cannot understand their state, so how can we use our terms for them?"

"So we can't understand the *entities* on Venus," mused Bob. " 'Incomprehensible to our intellects,' he says. Now suppose I follow your example and ask why he put 'intellects' in there? Why didn't he just say incomprehensible to us?"

"Why, then I'd have you look up his chapter on Mind," returned Dave. "There you would read that we have two minds, the lower reasoning intellect, and the higher intuitional mind, and then you could figure it out for yourself."

"I see," said Bob. "But let's get back to my original question. I think you've not answered that yet. Mr. Judge doesn't say that he supposes or imagines that this is what the beings on Venus are like. He just states it in so many words, as if it were a fact. How does he know? And how am I supposed to know?"

"From what we were saying a little while ago about confidence in teachers, and from what Mr. Judge says about the Elder Brothers having knowledge of the laws of nature in all departments, it isn't so hard to see where knowledge about Venus might come from, as far as the *Ocean* goes."

" 'Confidence had in his teachers'," Bob read from page two. "Does that mean you've got to take Theosophy on faith?"

"Why not?" asked Dave. "You go on faith in a science class, don't you?"

"*Do* I?"

"Think back," suggested Dave. "When you began your physics course, for instance, did the teacher give you questions or answers on physics? I mean, did he ask you or tell you what physics is about?"

"He told me, of course," laughed Bob. "I couldn't very well tell him—I didn't know anything about it!"

"You believed him?"

"Had to."

"And remember when you first learned the propositions of geometry? Did you prove them right away?"

"Not a bit of it. We only used them in problems. As a matter of fact," Bob recalled, "I think after a while we forgot that they'd never been proved to us. I remember it came as rather a surprise that we had to prove *them* in higher mathematics."

"Up to that time, didn't you take them on faith?"

"I suppose it *was* a kind of faith, come to think of it."

"And a profitable kind of faith, too, because if you hadn't had those axioms of geometry, and the formulas of trigonometry, you could never have learned the higher mathematics it takes to prove the fundamental propositions. Isn't that right?"

"Sure is," agreed Bob. "Strange, how you study math for years before you get around to verifying the formulas you use in the beginning. That's a long way 'round, isn't it?"

"Shortest way home, though," Dave said. "There isn't any other way you can learn. That's how you prove anything. You start with something which you either know or assume to be true, and then relate the unknown to that. And the 'proof' works both ways. If you use the multiplication table to save time counting, for instance, and you find that your problems come out right, then you know also that the multiplication table is right. You prove it by using it. But you have to have faith first in order to use it. You're not afraid of 'faith' any more, are you?" he finished jokingly.

"Not as much as I used to be, anyhow," returned Bob, in the same tone.

"You see," Dave continued, "Mr. Judge had confidence in his teachers, just as you do in yours, and for the same general reasons. For example, you said that when you began your physics course you didn't know anything about physics. But you don't mean that exactly, do you? You knew before you went to school that heat makes things expand, that gravity keeps you with your feet on the ground, and that a moving body has momentum, and so on?"

"Surely. But I didn't know those were the laws of physics until after I started the course."

"That's true enough. What I'm driving at is that the teacher wouldn't have had much luck trying to tell you that things fall up, would he?"

"No, I'd know that was wrong."

"Well, it's the same with Theosophy," Dave pointed out. "Right off you can tell that certain things in the *Ocean* are true, because you already know them. That is a basis for confidence in the teacher. And then there are the Fundamental Propositions which correspond to the axioms of mathematics. They are all contained in one phrase on page two: 'down to the smallest atom all is soul and spirit ever evolving under the rule of law which is inherent in the whole.' Universal soul and spirit is the first fundamental, law inherent in all life is the second, and evolution is the third.

"These propositions you assume to be true—perhaps you know them to some extent already. You certainly know that Nature is governed by law, for example. All you have to add to that is the axiom that man's actions are also under law, and you are well on the way to seeing the truth of the second proposition. Evolution is a familiar idea. Theosophy carries it to its highest power, the perfected men, elder brothers, more progressed entities. These two ideas rest on the first, that all life is sentient. Unless you have life everywhere you cannot have law everywhere, for law is only the way life acts. And you will see that evolution also requires universal life, if you think about it."

"Right now I'm still thinking about that little matter of Venus," Bob said. "Can you prove that by the axioms?"

"Of course," Dave replied. "All of Theosophy follows from them. But your problem might take a little 'higher Theosophy,' so to speak. To understand what kind of beings live on Venus, you have to develop a special power of mind, remember? That means learning the laws of mental evolution. Where will you find them? Mr. Judge tells you on page one—in Theosophy."

"Well, if that statement on Venus can't be proved by us now, why does Mr. Judge bring it up? And right at the start, too. What good does it do a beginner?" Bob wanted to know.

"You're a beginner, so you can answer that one. Has it done you any good? It made you think and ask questions, didn't it? Isn't that the way to learn? And if you read more of the writings of

Mr. Judge and Madame Blavatsky you will find other statements of the same nature. They can't be 'proved,' we say, and yet some part of us—our intuition, maybe, will recognize their truth. If not, that's all right, too. They are not necessary to an understanding of Theosophy. Rather, we need to know Theosophy to understand them. They may be facts to the teachers—Mr. Judge says the statements in the *Ocean* are made upon the knowledge of the writer—but as far as we are concerned, they are speculations. But even as speculations, they have their uses. Many have served to 'verify' the findings of modern science, as it approaches the teachings of Theosophy in its theories.

"You can accept Theosophy in the same spirit you accept mathematics, as a science capable of personal verification. Theosophy has in fact been called the mathematics of the soul, but unless you want to take someone else's word for it, you will have to study it yourself, work with its principles, and find out whether it solves the problems of the soul."

"Times of Heroism"

Times of heroism are generally times of terror, but the day never shines, in which this element may not work. The circumstances of man, we say, are historically somewhat better in this country, and at this hour, than perhaps ever before. More freedom exists for culture. It will not now run against an axe, at the first step out of the beaten track of opinion. But whoso is heroic, will always find crises to try his edge. Human virtue demands her champions and martyrs, and the trial of persecution always proceeds.

I see not any road of perfect peace, which a man can walk but to take counsel of his own bosom. Let him quit too much association, let him go home much, and stablish himself in those courses he approves. The unremitting retention of simple and high sentiments in obscure duties, is hardening the character to that temper which will work with honor, if need be, in the tumult, or on the scaffold. Whatever outrages have happened to men, may befall a man again; and very easily in a republic, if there appear any signs of a decay of religion. Coarse slander, fire, tar and feathers, and the gibbet, the youth may freely bring home to his mind, and with what sweetness of temper he can, and inquire how fast he can fix his sense of duty, braving such penalties, whenever it may please the next newspaper, and a sufficient number of his neighbors to pronounce his opinions incendiary.

—Emerson

WITHIN AND WITHOUT

EVOLUTION has been defined as the struggle of Self to free itself from partial viewpoints. This may sound too metaphysical and not enough practical at a time when our civilization is threatened with being engulfed in a sea of unsolvable problems that will spell its destruction, unless a practical solution is found. Yet, is it not perhaps precisely the "practical" approach to an understanding of life and the countless "practical" means suggested and tried for the better management of human affairs, that have led us to the point where, quite literally, there is *practically* no way out? Can it be we have been concerned too much with investigating, adjusting, changing *outer* conditions, things pertaining to the physical world, in short, too practical, and not enough metaphysical?

We all live simultaneously in two worlds—the physical, or the sum total of things that appear to us as *outside* of ourselves, and the metaphysical, or all that we experience *within,* our sensations, emotions, desires, ideas, aspirations, volitions. But the physical universe is really highly metaphysical. It is but the manifested, objective aspect of its unmanifested, subjective counterpart, the universe within each one. The inner world, in its turn, is the manifested aspect of the Spiritual Self at the center of every being. What we call matter, mind and spirit are but states of consciousness, the difference between them determined by the degree of Self-perception. Consciousness is the power to perceive as well as the power to *be* perceived, and neither one exists without the other. Spirit designates the power to perceive inherent in all Life, and Matter is but a name for the power of all Life to be perceived. When exercised, that is, during manifestation, this dual power results in the third aspect of Life—the power to *realize* its perceptions, what we call Mind. Before manifestation there is neither Spirit nor Matter, neither Subject nor Object, neither Within nor Without, nothing but Life, Consciousness, SELF.

Every Cycle of Necessity begins with pure Subjectivity or Spirit as one pole and pure Objectivity or Matter as the other pole of Existence, descends to a point where subjective and objective coexist in the same form and balance each other, in what we call "man," and then ascends again toward complete polarization of Consciousness into pure Spirit and pure Matter. But the moment we have *pure* Spirit and *pure* Matter we have neither one, and Manifesta-

tion ceases to be, for in an absolute sense there cannot be pure spirit or pure matter, for the two are identical. It is only as a portion of Life assumes the matter aspect, *i.e.,* manifests the power to be perceived, that there can be a realization of spirit, the power to perceive. There is no realization of within unless there is a without, there is no subject without an object, and the reverse is also true.

Theosophy teaches that *all* is Consciousness. Not only every being who lives and is aware of both the visible and the invisible worlds is consciousness, but consciousness also lies at the root and is the very essence and basis of everything seen or unseen experienced by any being within or without himself. Ordinary consciousness is the *power to be aware of something.* Self-consciousness is the *power to be aware of self* as distinct and separate from anything the self may be aware of without or within. The highest state of consciousness is the *power to be aware of Self as the only Reality,* regardless of anything perceived either without or within. These three degrees or states of consciousness are represented by Life in what we call the lower kingdoms, man, and the Perfected Beings. To beings in the lower kingdoms all experience is almost purely objective, or *without,* just because they have not yet any perception of self. To the ordinary man, partially conscious of Self, the world is divided into the without and the within; some experiences appear as objective, others as subjective. The Perfected Man lives a purely subjective existence. *To him all experience is within.*

Thus we see that consciousness ranges all the way from all-exclusiveness to all-inclusiveness, from matter to spirit, matter being that state of consciousness which excludes everything from self, and spirit that state of consciousness which includes everything in Self. To the one everything is without, to the other everything is within. But *the without is not different or separate from the within.* Perceiver and thing perceived are the two halves of one whole. The outside Universe is but the projection of the ideation of SELF upon the screen of lesser Selves, the Power to Perceive reflected on its own power to be perceived, and the innumerable degrees of beings represent but degrees of self-realization of the ONE SELF.

Nothing is really "without." It just seems to be. All we think to be aware of "outside" we are really aware of within our own consciousness. Whatever exists in the farthest reaches of cosmic space, whatever has taken place aeons ago, *exists, to us, within our consciousness.* What, then, is the seeming without, as contrasted with the within; what is the physical universe, the objective side of

life, the Great Illusion, from which is born the Heresy of Separateness? It is that portion of the SELF OF ALL which we have not yet learned to identify with ourselves. It is Self only partially aware of SELF.

If we think of a pyramid as symbolizing the Universe, and each stone as representing a being of individualized, but partial consciousness, then to each stone every other stone is without himself, although all are but parts of the whole pyramid. But to the synthetic consciousness of the pyramid as a whole all separate stones as well as the pyramid itself, are within. Thus perfection and imperfection, from the point of view of evolution, simply mean partial or full realization of Self. To the self that believes itself separate from the rest, there can be but seeming partialities, or imperfection. To the Self that has learned to identify all lesser selves with itself, there is nothing but wholeness or perfection.

The Perfected Being does not see parts of a whole, he sees One Whole made up of all its parts, and knows he *is* the Whole. Identification with the Self of All *is* Perfection. He who has universal self-consciousness need not "go" anywhere in order to "see" or "know" anything. He *is* at all times everywhere. Every thing and every being anywhere is a conscious ever-present instrument of perception *within* himself; the knowledge of all lesser selves is his knowledge. Thus he helps the still "imperfect" beings not by transforming imperfections into perfection, but by stimulating and inducing selves to expand their perception of SELF. Evolution, or the process of reaching toward Perfection, simply means overcoming partial viewpoints of Self.

Efforts to bring about better conditions in the world are all but attempts to transform imperfections into perfection by re-arranging conditions on the objective plane. It is like trying to correct unpleasant pictures on a screen while allowing the projector to go on ceaselessly projecting more unpleasant pictures. True reform consists in changing the pictures *within* the projector. Or, to vary the figure, the investigator of the outside universe, the "practical" materialist, is like a man projecting a beam of light from a flashlight in his hand into the surrounding darkness, and trying to reach the end of the beam, not realizing that the light cast by himself will forever recede into further darkness at the exact rate of his "advance."

The solution of the problems of mankind, the gaining of knowledge and power in a true sense, can never be achieved by searching without. Nor can the occult forces of Nature be discovered there,

for they do not exist on the objective plane at all, except as reflections. Modern research is dealing exclusively with reflected knowledge and forces, which are but shadows cast on the wall by a light unseen and unsuspected by the ordinary man—*his own power of consciousness*. The mightiest forces operating in objective Nature are but effects whose cause and source is on the subjective plane, the Universe within. Were any scientist able to proceed in his investigations but one single step *within* instead of forever searching on the outside, he would find himself the conscious possessor of powers the least of which exceeds any force now known to him, as the light of the Sun exceeds that of light artificially produced on earth.

And this quite literally, for to proceed within is to approach and avail oneself of the power emanating directly from the very Center or "Sun" of Life, the SELF. Modern attempts to liberate and use atomic energy are a peculiar combination of "right" and "wrong"—right, as intuitive perception that there is everywhere present in Nature an unlimited supply of measureless power; wrong, in the direction pursued and methods used, and, above all, without the proper motive. The Greatest of the Great, locked up in the Smallest of the Small, will never be found by smashing atoms on the physical plane, or by any other material means. The One Source of all Power is *the* ATOM (not atoms), the SELF, of which every speck of substance and spark of Life is but a partial expression and reflection. The Path of It lies *within* the Self of each, and sooner or later must be travelled by every Pilgrim Soul.

The whole of Life is but Self seeing itself, speaking and listening to itself, helping, hindering itself, laughing or weeping at itself, SELF at all times fully conscious of the fact, Selves lost in the self-created world without. But lost only temporarily, for in the fullness of time Self shakes off the Great Illusion and awakens from a dream which lasted countless ages, and yet never was the SELF.

"THE SOUL'S WORKSHOP"

He that seeks not to affix things external to the soul, to subordinate the shows of nature to the Ideas of the Spirit, doeth nought. His life is a waste. To the soul are space and time given not as adding aught to its indwelling treasures, for it is richer and fuller than these phenomena, but to serve and honor it. Space is the soul's workshop, and Time is its work-day while incarnate and plying organic instruments. —BRONSON ALCOTT

GLAMOUR

Its Purpose and Place in Magic

THE word "glamour" was long ago defined in old dictionaries as "witchery or a charm on the eyes, making them see things differently from what they really are." This is still the meaning of the word. Not long ago, before the strange things possible in hypnotic experiments became known to the Western world, it seemed as if everything would be reduced to mere matter and motion by the fiat of science. Witchery was to fade away, be forgotten, be laughed out of sight, and what could not be ascribed to defective training of the senses was to have its explanation in the state of the liver, a most prosaic organ. But before science with its speculation and ever-altering canons could enlighten the unlearned multitude, hypnotism crept slowly and surely forward and at last began to buttress the positions of theosophy. Glamour stands once more a fair chance for recognition. Indeed, H. P. B. uttered prophetic words when she said that in America more than anywhere else this art would be practised by selfish men for selfish purposes, for money-getting and gratification of desire.

Hurriedly glancing over some fields of folk-lore, see what a mass of tales bearing on glamour produced by men, gods, or elementals. In India the gods every now and then, often the sages, appear before certain persons in various guises by means of a glamour which causes the eye to see what is not really there. In Ireland volumes of tales in which the person sees houses, men, and animals where they are not; he is suddenly given the power to see under the skin of natural things, and then perceives the field or the market-place full of fairies, men, and women gliding in and out among the people. Anon a man or woman is changed into the appearance of animal or bird, and only regains the old semblance when touched with the magic rod. This change of appearance is not a change in fact, but always a glamour affecting the eyes of the other person. Such a mass of similar stories found during all time and among every people cannot be due to folly nor be without a basis. The basis is a fact and a law in man's nature. It is glamour, the reason for glamour, and the power to bring it about. Just because there have always been those who, either by natural ability or training, had the power to bring on a "witchery over the eyes," these stories have arisen.

Note.—This article was first printed by William Q. Judge in the *Path*, May, 1893.

A writer well known in England and America once thought he had found a mare's nest when he reported that Mme. Blavatsky had confessed to him that certain phenomena he enquired of had been caused by glamour.

"Ah, glamour!" he said; "thus falls this theosophic house of cards"; and he went away satisfied, for in truth he had been himself thoroughly glamoured. But theosophists should not stumble and fall violently as this gentleman did over a word which, when enquired into, carries with it a good deal of science relating to an important branch of occultism. When I read in an issue of the *Arena* all about this confession on glamour, I was quite ready to believe that H. P. B. did say to the learned enquirer what he reported, but at the same time, of course, knew that she never intended to apply her enchantment explanation to every phenomenon. She only intended to include certain classes,—although in every occult phenomenon there is some glamour upon some of the observers according to their individual physical idiosyncrasies.

The classes of phenomena covered by this word are referred to in part by Patanjali in his *Yoga Aphorisms,* where he says that if the luminousness natural to object and eye is interfered with the object will disappear, whether it be man or thing and whether it be day or night. This little aphorism covers a good deal of ground, and confutes, if accepted, some theories of the day. It declares, in fact, that not only is it necessary for rays of light to proceed from the object to the eye, but also light must also proceed from the eye towards the object. Cut off the latter and the object disappears; alter the character of the luminousness coming from the eye, and the object is altered in shape or color for the perceiver.

Carrying this on further and connecting it with the well-known fact that we see no objects whatever, but only their ideal form as presented to the mind, and we arrive at an explanation in part of how glamour may be possible. For if in any way you can interfere with the vibrations proceeding to the eye on the way to affect the brain and then the percipient within, then you have the possibility of sensibly altering the ideal form which the mind is to cognize within before it declares the object to be without which produced the vibration.

Take up now imagination in its aspect of a power to make a clear and definite image. This is done in hypnotism and in spiritualism. If the image be definite enough and the perceiver or subject sensitive enough, a glamour will be produced. The person will see

that which is not the normal shape or form or corporature of the other. But this new shape is as real as the normal, for the normal form is but that which is to last during a certain stage of human evolution and will certainly alter as new senses and organs develop in us.

Thus far having gone, is it not easy to see that if a person can make the definite and vivid mind-pictures spoken of, and if the minor organs can affect and be affected, it is quite probable and possible that trained persons may have glamoured the eyes of others so to make them see an elephant, snake, man, tree, pot, or any other object where only is empty space, or as an alteration of a thing or person actually there? This is exactly what is done in experiments by the hypnotists, with this difference, that they have to put the subject into an abnormal state, while the other operators need no such adventitious aids. Glamour, then, has a very important place in magic. That it was frequently used by H. P. B. there is not the smallest doubt, just as there is no doubt that the yogee in India puts the same power into operation.

In many cases she could have used it by making the persons present think they saw her when she had gone into the next room, or that another person was also present who was not in fact. The same power of glamour would permit her to hide from sight any object in the room or in her hands. This is one of the difficult feats of magic, and not in the slightest degree dependent on legerdemain. Persons sometimes say this is folly even if true, but looked at in another light it is no folly, nor are the cases those in which anyone was entitled to know all that was going on. She exhibited these feats —seldom as it was—for the purpose of showing those who were learning from her that the human subject is a complicated and powerful being, not to be classed, as science so loves to do, with mere matter and motion. All these phenomena accomplished two objects. First, to help those who learned from her, and second, to spread abroad again in the west the belief in man's real power and nature. The last was a most necessary thing to do because in the West materialism was beginning to have too much sway and threatened to destroy spirituality. And it was done also in pursuance of the plans of the Great Lodge for the human race. As one of her Masters said, her phenomena puzzled sceptics for many years. Even now we see the effects, for when such men as Stead, the Editor of the *Review of Reviews,* and Du Prel, Schiaparelli, and others take

up the facts of Spiritualism scientifically, one can perceive that another day for psychology is dawning.

This power of glamour is used more often than people think, and not excluding members of the T. S., by the Adepts. They are often among us from day to day appearing in a guise we do not recognize, and are dropping ideas into men's minds about the spiritual world and the true life of the soul, as well as also inciting men and women to good acts. By this means they pass unrecognized and are able to accomplish more in this doubting and transition age than they could in any other way. Sometimes as they pass they are recognized by those who have the right faculty, but a subtle and powerful bond and agreement prevents their secret from being divulged. This is something for members of the Society to think of, for they may be entertaining now and then angels unawares. They may now and then be tried by their leaders when they least expect it, and the verdict is not given out but has its effect all the same.

But glamour covers only a small part of the field of occultism. The use of the astral body enters into nearly all of the phenomena, and in other directions the subject of occult chemistry, absolutely unknown to the man of the day, is of the utmost importance; if it is ever given out it will be a surprise to science, but certainly that divulgation will not soon be to such a selfish age.

WILLIAM BREHON

"THE ELECTRIC FLASH OF TRUTH"

The world is not yet free from superstition, and we, a part of it, must have some traces left of the same thing. Masters have said that a great shadow follows all innovations in the life of humanity; the wise one will not bring on that shadow too soon and not until some light is ready to fall at the same time for breaking up the darkness. Masters could give now all the light and knowledge needed, but there is too much darkness that would swallow up all the light, except for a few bright souls, and then a greater darkness would come on. Many of us could not grasp nor understand all that might be given, and to us would result a danger and new difficulty for other lives, to be worked out in pain and sorrow. It is from kindness and love that Masters do not blind us with the electric flash of truth complete.

—W. Q. J.

ON THE LOOKOUT

"What Kind of Universe?"

In the *Christian Century* (June 16) the Editors expound their self-styled religion of realism in its application to the problems, or rather, the tragedies of life, and especially to the tragedy of war. The editorial is in answer to a question propounded by a correspondent who quotes the Editors' own words in a previous statement:

> What kind of a universe [he asks] is it which thrusts a Christian into a position where he is unable to submit his actions to "any moral criterion such as the moral teaching of Jesus or the ethical code of any civilized people"?

The Editors answer:

> Our answer is that it is just that kind of universe! It is the kind of universe in which the Christian, like every other person, is sometimes thrust—perhaps by his own individual sin or, on a larger scale, by the sin of the human community in which he shares—into tragic situations which cannot be resolved by conformity to the moral teaching of Jesus. . . .

"The Pervasive Reality of Sin"

> Christian faith accepts the universe! It is not a faith which seeks to escape from tragedy. It tolerates no illusions about reality. It abjures all fantastic philosophies and all obscurantist mysticisms by which man tries to lift himself out of the real universe into a universe of imagination. . . . Christianity faces squarely the fact that this universe is not ideal, that God's creative activity is not yet done, that he has "not yet finished man," that there is ugliness as well as beauty in the world, cruelty as well as compassion, error as well as truth, pain and sorrow as well as comfort and joy, necessity as well as freedom, and through all there runs the pervasive reality of sin.

As the *Century,* in the name of Christianity, pleads its case, the reader may profitably remember that Christianity, according to the *Century,* stoutly rejects *all fantastic philosophies and all obscurantist mysticisms* postulating a "universe of imagination." How "God's creative activity" can be judged by human mind *sans* imagination has yet to be explained.

Much More Than the Teaching of Jesus

> Christianity confronts these raw, gross realities of our human universe and deals with them; it does not try to escape them. The unflinching steadiness of its realism is nowhere more clearly displayed than in its dealing with man's moral freedom. This capacity

> for freedom is man's most distinguishing characteristic. Yet, lofty as is its conception of man, Christianity will not let him cherish the illusion that his freedom is unlimited. It shatters his illusion that he can always do what, morally, he ought to do, and brings him to the abyss of moral despair where he cries out with Paul, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?" The Christian gospel comes penetratingly to man only when he realizes the tragic nature of his moral experience—that he cannot always do what he ought to do. Therefore Christianity is much more than the moral teaching of Jesus. It is not primarily moralistic at all, but realistic.

The capacity for freedom is man's distinguishing characteristic, and yet man is not even free to do what is right—much less what is wrong! This is perversive, not pervasive reality, an earthly, rather than a lofty conception of man. The "freedom" granted man in Christianity is, if the *Century* is to be believed, on a par with the animal's "freedom" to act instinctively. Animal action is free, indeed, from such a disturbing element as the power of moral choice. Has "Christian realism" incorporated the degrading theory of animal evolution, and ignored the imperative of human evolution, an evolution accomplished by man's exercise of his power to choose, to act, to learn and thus progress? If so, what determined the choice of Christian realism—fact or fancy, truth or dogma, free thought or blind belief?

"The Necessity of Sin"

The editorial also quotes from two letters in the *Christian News-Letter,* published in London. From the first:

> The difficult problem to present, in short, is that of what one might call the *necessity of sin.* That is to say, that we have got into the position—indeed, that humanity is chronically more or less deeply in the position—in which it is necessary to do what is wrong.

But at such outright "realism," the *Christian Century* demurs. The Editors draw a fine line between the "pervasive reality" of sin, and the *necessity* of sin:

> The phrase, "necessity of sin," is unfortunate. A necessity cannot be a sin. If an action is a necessity it can hardly be said to lie under moral judgment, but can only be regarded as non-moral or amoral. It would have been better had the writer said that war puts upon us the necessity of doing that which, *outside of such necessity,* is sin. (The Christian Century holds that war, after it has begun, is not sin; it is hell, the fruit or wages of sin.)

The foregoing passage (parenthetical note not ours) establishes, for those who use words as cloaks, that there is no such thing as a

"necessary evil"; it is either necessary (in which case it is amoral) or it is not (in which case it is immoral). It may be argued, however, that the question is not, How can a necessity be a sin? but, How can a sin be "necessary"? Necessity is also the theme of the second letter:

> . . . only by recognizing the *tragic situation* of fallen humanity, which has made war a recurring calamity to his [the soldier's] societies, can we realize the full pathos of a *necessity* which drives men, as much by good motives as bad ones, to seek each other's physical extinction, mass by mass, with all the attendant evils of disrupting their own societies in the process. The situation which has brought civilized man to the practice of such enormities *by necessity* must surely be the product of sin which is original—in the common as well as the theological sense of the word.

Here we have arrived at that theological prime mover—Original Sin, that rock upon which rests the "unflinching steadiness" of Christian realism. This is the necessity for sin—God's necessity, in short, because granting for the sake of argument that man has original sin, from whom did he receive it, if not from God?

"A Cosmic Net"

But if Christianity is thus firmly and calmly poised amidst the tragedies of life, the individual Christian is not. In fact, the *Century* deplores "the moral confusion which besets the Christian mind," and which, the editors assert,

> arises from an un-Christian conception of the universe, that is, of reality. The modern Christian mind is obfuscated by a too simple moralism which regards all human action as simply right or wrong. It is confused, primarily, by its assumption that the universe can be defined in purely moralistic terms, that the moral law has been flung out like a cosmic net to cover the whole field of reality.

But there is one explanation of this curious phenomenon of ideas inexplicably ingrained in men's minds, which requires neither imagination nor originality (of sin) for its understanding: namely, that morality is *inherent in the soul itself*. This is very ancient teaching, not a matter of belief or fancy, but of the facts and laws of human nature as taught by those who know them. And this is the teaching modern Theosophy presents for the free consideration of all men.

Christian Realism

The Editors continue with their contention that the Christian view of the Universe is not fundamentally moralistic, but realistic. "Christianity," they declare, "does not derive reality from morality;

it derives morality from reality." Christian realism, it appears, requires that man repent for sin which is not his by right of reason or justice, but is originally his by God. This is how God "acknowledges man's freedom"—by writing off on man a moral debt he never incurred. American revolutionaries, seeking political freedom in 1775, protested against "taxation without representation." It might have a salutary effect on man's mental and moral freedom if some Christian revolutionaries now protested against "damnation without representation."

Man to Be "Finished"?

The *Century* concludes by defining repentance as not tearful regret or sorrow, but "a changed *mind,* a new *purpose!*" Now, this is a marvel indeed. Does the *Century* suggest that man abandon his simple moralism of right and wrong, and act from necessity only? Perhaps man is not after all the one who should determine how man should act? If God has "not yet finished man," is it to be inferred that when He does finish man He will add a touch of original virtue, equalizing man's propensities for good and evil, and cancel out the *necessity* for moral law? If such be His intention, His believers would do well to pray for Divine Haste, lest man finish *himself* first, and that not spiritually, but materially!

This Kind of Universe

Theosophists would suggest a "new" purpose, with a difference. Theosophists would have men revert to the time-honoured purpose which each individual serves, consciously or unconsciously, throughout all the circumstances of life—the purpose to learn. This purpose is natural to the child, to the youth, to the adult: those who would live must learn. No end has yet been found to learning. And he who learns living, learns to love life, and sees neither tragedy nor joy as the exclusive reality. To him, both are means of learning; both serve the purpose of life. This is "a changed mind," or rather, a new attitude of mind, which is a prerequisite in any education. Many would-be reformers have worked for this, correctly deducing that unless you change the mind, you have not changed the man.

The method of work differs. The *Christian Century,* for instance, recommends that the Christian church preach its gospel "with the thunder of prophetic authority." But this is to miss the point that man has to change his own mind—no other can do it for him. The

wisest of men have concentrated on preaching, practising, and promulgating ideas whose only authority is their inherent truth. From time immemorial these ideas have been presented: a living universe, a lawful universe, and a purposeful universe; man an immortal spirit of the nature of freedom and power, of dignity and responsibility, and above all of justice. When man *knows* this, he is perfect, for he is a god.

"A CLEAN DEFEAT"

The *New Republic* (July 5) account of the race riots which have recently swept over the United States must have brought flushes of shame to the faces of Americans who love their native land, who hate the thought of leaving this ignoble heritage to future generations. The writer, Thomas Sancton, paints a lurid picture of the break-down of the Four Freedoms at home. He begins:

> All these words of anguish which swirl and flow through the press and out upon the air waves in the wake of the Detroit race riot are useless. The thing is done. What we say about the riot can never raise thirty-one men and women from the grave. What we say about it can never heal smashed mouths and ruptured eyeballs. It can never quiet the terrors of a hundred thousand Negro children who will remember all their lives what happened to them here in America. It can never replace lost tanks and planes. It can never redeem the legion of lost Americans, the fascists of Detroit.
>
> It can never silence the Tokyo radio. We have lost a battle in Detroit. It was a clean defeat. Nothing was salvaged.

It is well that this writer is more concerned with the suffering Negroes than with the loss of tanks and planes due to an interruption on the production line. When, recently, *Life* printed some action pictures of the Detroit riots, showing quite plainly the aggressive attacks of whites on Negroes, a business man was heard to groan unhappily, "What a scoop for the Axis!" No word of pity for the persecuted racial group, for the bereaved mothers and wives of murdered men—men who, in some cases, police were unable to protect; only concern over the "propaganda value" of the incident to the Axis!

STORY OF DETROIT

Too many Americans have this attitude toward the suffering caused directly or indirectly by the war. Too many Americans think of food for starving Europe as merely a "weapon," not as a means of ending untold misery, or rather, of lessening it a little. The war

has done something strange and horrible to the nation. It is making us hate others—our enemies; it is making us insensible to the sufferings of still others—our former allies. It may finally make us hate ourselves. The story of Detroit, told by Thomas Sancton, shows the effect of hate toward those whom we have wronged.

> In the last three years Detroit has swollen and festered with all our accumulated national poisons. Detroit brought them to an ugly, pustulate head. There was race hate there older than the Nazi Party, older than the American Constitution; and there were new treasons and new traitors, rank with the fascist evil. Detroit is our fourth largest city, with two and a half million population in the greater industrial area. Hundreds of thousands of these were Negro families, who came up from Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, and Louisiana during the last war and through the twenties. Special trains were run from Southern cotton fields to carry the Negro migration. Later, during the thirties and especially after present armament expansion began, white Southerners and other outlanders, by the hundreds of thousands, came to work in the plants. The old subdued, muted, murderous Southern race war was transplanted into a high-speed industrial background. I do not mean that the presence of Southern whites and Negroes was alone responsible for the Detroit tension, but it was one of the important factors. There were other raw, fascist-minded newcomers. There were other distinct, clannish groups like the Poles.

"Sunday Symphony"

And so the witches' brew of Detroit unrest and racial conflict built to a climax. The Ku Klux Klan was revived. The Black Legion and Father Coughlin flourished in Detroit. Gerald K. Smith, demagogue after the Huey Long pattern, moved to the automobile city. Nazi bunds found followers, and a Negro nationalist society, said to have been inspired by Japanese agents, was formed. In Sancton's words, "The Sunday broadcasts over Detroit's radio stations were a babble of racism, fundamentalism, ignorance and guile. They stank of an anti-democratic ferment going on below the city's surface. No city, North or South, could match this hellish Sunday symphony of the Detroit radio stations."

"News," it has been said, "is what does not happen. And the more it does not happen the more it becomes news." This would suggest that minority persecution is "news" in America because it is the "exception." We can only hope that the exception will prove the rule of freedom to differ that is the chief safeguard to the life

of liberty in any civilization. The suffering in Detroit has a grave lesson for every American citizen in the inhumanity of discrimination of race, caste, creed or color.

REFLECTING ON THE PAST

Indeed, racial discrimination in America has scant warrant for existence, as the history of the American continents show. Mr. Judge, in "On the Future: A Few Reflections," has suggested the larger implications of the New World civilization. Fifty years ago, he wrote:

> It seems as if some power, deliberately planning, had selected North and South America for the place where a new primary race should be begun. These two continents were evidently the seats of ancient races and not the habitat of wild undeveloped men. The red man of the Northern one has all the appearance and beliefs of a once great race. He believes in one God, a Devachan of happy hunting after death. Some tribes have diagrams of how the world was formed and peopled, that strangely resemble the Hindu cosmogony, and their folk-lore bears deep marks of having come down from an older and better time. Following the course of exploration southwards, we find accumulating evidences all the way of a prior civilization now gone with the cyclic wave which brought it up. . . .
>
> In the course of time these continents became what might be called arable land, lying waiting, recuperating until the European streams of men began to pour upon it. The Spanish overflowed South America and settled California and Mexico; the English, French and Spanish took the North, and later all nations came, so that now in both continents nearly every race is mixed and still mixing. Chinese even have married women of European blood; Hindus are also here; the ancient Parsi race has its representatives; the Spanish mixed with the aborigines, and the slaveholders with the Africans. I doubt not but that some one from every race known to us has been here and has left, within the last two hundred years, some impression through mixture of blood. . . .
>
> So then, in America now is forming the new sub-race, and in this land was founded the present Theosophical Society: two matters of great importance (THEOSOPHY IV, 402).

THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT

The moral crisis faced today by men and women the whole world over should rouse at least some to search for a practical philosophy which can meet and conquer the tide of human passion. An unshakable foundation for unity among all men, no matter what their differences of individual opinion, must be provided if universal brotherhood

s ever to become a fact in human society. Individual liberty, in the final analysis, will be found to depend upon the conviction that each man is his own authority in all matters which concern him. It is for this reason that the chief aim of the Theosophical Movement, in this as in all other eras, is to establish and maintain the independence of the soul. In the words of Madame Blavatsky:

> It is not alone for the esoteric philosophy that we fight; nor for any modern system of moral philosophy, but for the inalienable right of private judgment, and especially for the ennobling idea of a future life of activity and accountability. (*Isis,* II, 120.)

"The Discovery of Freedom"

Americans have, perhaps, an unique opportunity to uphold "the inalienable right of private judgment," because of the very origin of their government. A country founded by minority groups is not likely to encourage absolutism in any form. The exceptional nature of the American Republic may be reviewed to advantage here. As described by Rose Wilder Lane in *The Discovery of Freedom* (New York: John Day Company, 1943):

> The Royal charters had been grants of freedoms, from Government to its subjects. They rested on the old pagan belief that Authority controls individuals, that this Authority is Government, and that no individual can do anything without permission from that controlling Authority.
>
> But Americans knew, and the Declaration stated, that there is no such superior Authority. All men are born equally of the same human kind and equally endowed with inalienable liberty. Therefore, it is the men in Government who can do nothing without permission from the individuals whom they govern.
>
> This meant turning all past Old World experience upside down. There was no precedent in known history, for a Government that was not (believed to be) a controlling Authority.
>
> But there were the Royal charters. It was necessary only to turn them upside-down. So the delegates [to the Constitutional Convention] wrote documents that were grants of certain freedoms, from the folks back home to the men in public office.
>
> These documents were the first Constitutions in the history of the world (pp. 187-8).

"Bill of Prohibitions"

> Grudgingly and most suspiciously, Americans did at last accept this new kind of Government. But only on condition that every Constitution, while it granted certain limited permissions to men

in Government, also definitely prohibited their using force as Governments always had used force.

These prohibitions are called the Bills of Rights.

The name is not a good one, because it is not accurate. It confuses a careless mind. . . .

An American Bill of Rights is the exact reverse of the English one. The "Bill of Rights" in American Constitutions is a statement of the uses of force which American citizens do *not* permit to men in American Government. . . . An American "Bill of Rights" is in fact a Bill of Prohibitions. It prohibits the men in public office here, to do acts customary everywhere else when these Bills were written, and today either continuing or revived nearly everywhere on this earth.

The true revolutionary course which must be followed toward a free world is a cautious, experimental process of further decreasing the uses of force which individuals permit to Government; of increasing the prohibitions of Government's action, and thus decreasing the use of brute force in human affairs (p. 190).

A Pride of American Democracy

The unerring tendency in the universe to restore disturbed equilibrium gave U. S. citizens, in the same month that the riots occurred, a deed as bright with promise of good as the violence in Detroit was dark with foreboding of evil. For in June, 1943, the United States Supreme Court gave voice to a brave declaration of the principles of civil liberty. The Court, wrote Arthur Krock, Washington correspondent for the New York *Times,* was "at its peak." "When the court rises to its full height it proves its claim to be regarded as one of the great prides of American democracy," he said. The occasion was the reversal of the Court's decision in the so-called Gobitis case (June, 1940).

In the original decision, reviewed in Lookout for February, 1942, the Supreme Court held that public school authorities had the power to compel pupils to salute the national flag, even though the ground for refusal was purely religious and had no element of disloyalty to the country. This involved the sect known as "Jehovah's Witnesses," one of whose religious beliefs forbids salute to any national flag on the ground that it is paying homage to an "image" and contrary to the second of the Biblical ten commandments. Chief Justice Harlan Stone was the sole dissenter from the majority decision, and an extract from his opinion is quoted in THEOSOPHY, XXX, 186.

An Honest Confession

In June, 1942, occurred a further development in the Gobitis case. Another trial involving the Jehovah's Witnesses was before the court and in the dissenting opinion on this case (*Jones v. City of Opelika*), three of the judges who had concurred in the Gobitis decision "confessed error." They said:

> The opinion of the court sanctions a device which in our opinion suppresses or tends to suppress the free exercise of a religion practised by a minority group. This is but another step in the direction which *Minersville v. Gobitis* took against the same religious minority and is a logical extension of the princples upon which that decision rested. *Since we joined in the opinion in the Gobitis case, we think this is an appropriate occasion to state that we now believe that it was also wrongly decided.* [Italics ours.] Certainly our democratic form of government functioning under the historic Bill of Rights has a high responsibility to accommodate itself to the religious views of minorities, however unpopular and unorthodox those views may be. The first amendment does not put the right freely to exercise religion in a subordinate position. We fear however that the opinions in this and in the Gobitis case do exactly that.

The Gobitis Decision Reversed

After this confession, it was evident that the Gobitis decision could not stand. The case came before the Supreme Court again, and exactly three years after the decision, the Court (divided six to three) reversed itself. Justice Robert Jackson wrote the opinion for the majority. Justice Felix Frankfurter, who wrote the former majority (eight to one) opinion, still adheres to his original views. The following are excerpts from Justice Jackson's opinion:

> The Fourteenth Amendment, as now applied to the States, protects the citizen against the State itself and all of its creatures—Boards of Education not excepted. These have, of course, important, delicate, and highly discretionary functions, but none that they may not perform within the limits of the Bill of Rights. That they are educating the young for citizenship is reason for scrupulous protection of Constitutional freedoms of the individual, if we are not to strangle the free mind at its source and teach youth to discount important principles of our government as mere platitudes.
>
> To sustain the compulsory flag salute we are required to say that a Bill of Rights which guards the individual's right to speak his own mind left it open to public authorites to compel him to utter what is not in his mind.

"THE UNANIMITY OF THE GRAVEYARD"

> There are village tyrants as well as village Hampdens, but none who acts under color of law is beyond reach of the Constitution.
>
> The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press, freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections.
>
> Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard.
>
> We can have intellectual individualism and the rich cultural diversities that we owe to exceptional minds only at the price of occasional eccentricity and abnormal attitudes. When they are so harmless to others or to the State as those we deal with here, the price is not too great. But freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be a mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order.

"CONSTITUTIONAL CONSTELLATION"

Justice Jackson's opinion concludes:

> If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein. If there are any circumstances which permit an exception, they do not now occur to us.

The reversal of the Gobitis case was generally hailed with enthusiasm as one of the most noteworthy and important of civil liberties decisions. The practical idealism of the majority statement should do much to leaven the lump of authoritarian orthodoxy that has been growing in this country as in the world at large. The highest court of the land has risen in this decision to the lofty level of the pioneers in American justice. "The fixed star in our constitutional constellation" was set in place only after what Jefferson characterized as the "severest contest in which I have ever been engaged," —the battle for recognition of freedom of worship, freedom of opinion and of conscience. This is the pole-star of the American Republic, and only as the nation charts its course by this set principle will the aim and purpose of its Founders be realized.